

ADDENDUM

***PUBLIC COMMENT
AND RESPONSES***

RATS

Rockford Area Transportation Study Metropolitan Planning Organization

City of Rockford, Public Works Department
425 East State Street, Rockford, IL 61104

POLICY COMMITTEE

Mayor Lawrence J. Morrissey, City of Rockford
Mayor Darryl F. Lindberg, City of Loves Park
Board Chairman Scott H. Christiansen, Winnebago County
President Linda M. Vaughn, Village of Machesney Park
Mayor Frederic C. Brereton, City of Belvidere
Board Chairman Susan L. Anderson, Boone County
Deputy Director Gregory L. Mounts, Illinois Department of
Transportation, Region 2

PUBLIC COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

Public comments and input into the RATS Year 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) is an on-going, continuous process. In other words, the public is always welcome to submit comments to the LRTP (and all other RATS documents) at any time. All RATS Policy Committee and Technical Committee meetings are open to the public and comments are welcome during those meetings.

During the preparation of the draft of the LRTP, regular updates of the process of this document were given at all RATS meetings. As the LRTP was being developed, one of the important steps was to identify the process to inform and involve the public and to follow the RATS Public Involvement Process to seek public input. It was decided that the draft document was to be made widely available to the general public by all means of communication. The draft LRTP:

1. was put on the web site
(<http://cityofrockford.net/government/works/index.cfm?section=planning&id=977>)
2. a series of PUBLIC INFORMATION OPEN HOUSES (PIOH) were held to seek and receive public comments and input. Four PIOH were held on July 6th and 7th, 2005 at four different locations in the Rockford Metro Planning Area. The four locations are listed on the attached PIOH informational sheet (attachment 1).
3. the above-mentioned attachment was mailed out to all persons and organizations on the RATS mailing lists including the media and libraries.
4. a legal notice was published in the April 27, 2005 edition of the Rock River Times announcing the tentative schedule of action by RATS. A copy of this notice is attached (attachment 2).
5. as described in Chapter 5 of the LRTP, a series of three workshops were held to encourage public involvement in the bicycle/pedestrian system planning process. This group represented a cross section of stakeholders from throughout the Rockford MPA who have a special interest in these modes of transportation. To gather interest for the initial meeting, the local daily newspaper (the Rockford Register Star) published an article to inform the general public when the meeting was going to be held and on how to contact the RATS planning staff. As a result of this article, RATS staff received about 50 e-mails and telephone calls. A copy of this article is attached (attachment 3). The League of Illinois Bicyclists (LIB) submitted comments during the process of these meetings (attachment 4). These comments will also be used in the forthcoming RATS Bicycle/Pedestrian Study.

Obviously, the major effort to inform the general public was the four PIOH held in early July 2005. The locations and the facilities that were selected were accessible to the public at two different time periods

(11:00 AM to 2:00 PM and 3:30 PM to 7:00 PM) at public buildings for these two days. The information that was presented was the same for each of the four locations. Also, public comment forms were made available to be filled out at the location or to be mailed by July 25, 2005. A copy of the public form is attached (attachment 5). As a result of these four PIOH, forty-three (43) people signed the attendance lists. Copies of the four sign-in sheets are attached (attachment 6).

During the comment period of the LRTP, thirteen (13) written and e-mail responses were received. Listed below is the name of the person, organization and subject of their comments. Copies of the actual comments are attached (attachment 7).

	<u>Name of Person</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>Comment Subject</u>
1	Karen Kjellquist	July 4, 2005		Air Quality
2	Renee' Lee Greco	July 4, 2005		Public Transportation & Bicycle
3	Wayne Paulson	July 6, 2005		East Side Arterial & Willow Creek Bike Path
4	Margo Olson	July 6, 2005		East Side Arterial
5	JoAnne Reed	July 6, 2005		East Side Arterial
6	Bev Moore	July 7, 2005		Final Copy of LRTP
7	Thomas Butler	July 11, 2005		Bicycle Connections
8	Linda Labuguen	July 13, 2005		Public Transportation
9	Linda A. Slabaugh	July 18, 2005		Willow Creek Bike Path
10	Paula Hughes	July 19, 2005	RMTD	Technical Corrections to Chapter 8 – Transit
11	Jerry Paulson	July 22, 2005		Air Quality
12	Stanley Campbell	July 28, 2005	Sierra Club–Blackhawk	Air Quality
13	Ginny Gregory	Sept, 9, 2005	City of Rockford-CD Dept	Technical Corrections to Report

Of the thirteen (13) comments received, the issues/remarks can be divided into the following general categories:

1. Air Quality - 3
2. Public Transportation - 2
3. Bicycle Facilities - 1
4. Willow Creek Bike Path: Connection between Rock Cut State Park the Long Prairie Path - 2
5. East Side Arterial (Project number 32 on Map 7-3) - 3
6. Technical Corrections – 2

1. AIR QUALITY

The first responder on this issue referenced an article written by an “op-ed columnist” from the New York Times regarding the planning and actions undertaken by the Portland, Oregon metro area to improve the region’s overall air quality while maintaining a good economic climate. This article suggests that it is possible to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the air by providing transportation funds to increase the service levels of public transportation and constructing more bicycle facilities to encourage bicycling while, at the same time, maintaining the good economy of the Portland area. The final analysis in this column is that the overall environment can be improved, both from a financial and physical point-of-view.

This is the premise for essentially all transportation plans that are prepared; to maintain and improve the economic, social and physical environment in any urban or metropolitan area. This is the principle for planning and implementing all transportation projects, and at the same time, maintaining an acceptable level-of-service for all modes of transportation. In the RATS 2035 LRTP this objective is the constant theme throughout the entire document. The Rockford Metro area has many advantages for businesses and citizens to locate, live and work in this area. Prime examples are access to interstate travel, an

excellent labor force, close proximately to other urban areas (Chicago, Milwaukee and Madison) and one of the best market-rate housing values in the United States. In the RATS 2035 LRTP, expansion of commuter rail to and from the Chicago region is in the plan, as well as connecting and expanding the bicycle path network to an on-street system of bicycle lanes and routes, and improving the existing street and highway network to accommodate the expected employment and population growth. At the same time, the RATS 2035 LRTP addresses the land uses changes that will be occurring in the area as a result of the housing expansion and employment growth. The employment growth is planned in four primary areas; (1) the area around the Greater Rockford Airport (GRA), (2) the Belvidere Daimler-Chrysler facility and surrounding area, including the Tollway Station Point area, (3) the Interstate 90/39 corridor along the east-side of Rockford-Loves Park-Machesney Park-Roscoe, and (4) the southwest Rockford area (which is in close proximate to the GRA).

The other two responders raised the issue of increasing air pollutants (primarily ozone levels) as a result of housing and employment growth in the Interstate 90/39 corridor along the east-side of Winnebago County. One of the major reasons for increasing levels of air pollutants in this corridor is the Illinois State Toll Highway Authority (ISTHA) toll plazas in Belvidere (Plaza 5) and Roscoe (Plaza 1). Recently, the ISTHA started a major improvement and reconstruction plan to 90% of their system mileage which includes reconstruction of their mainline toll collection plazas. The two plazas mentioned above are included in this reconstruction plan and are included in the RATS FY 2006-2008 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). Plaza 1 has experienced congestion and back-up problems at certain times and days during the past several years. At these congestive times, traffic is backing up several miles at this plaza location.

To address these issues, RATS believes that the following initiatives will maintain the overall air quality within the next 30 years:

- reconstruction of the ISTHA plazas to "Open Road Tolling"
- increased usage of the I-PASS pre-paid toll collection system thus reducing the need to stop at the plazas
- elimination of Plaza 3 at the I-90/I-39/US 51 interchange (another congestive toll collection spot that was removed in 2004)
- providing more capacity by adding a third lane, which also relieves problems due to the large volume of trucks
- improved automobile emissions due to manufacturer improvements
- continued monitoring of air quality emissions and data at the two Illinois Environmental Protection Agencies ozone stations in Winnebago County
- increased access to the I-90/I-39 corridor by constructing new interchanges at IL 173 and the future extension of Perry Creek Road
- an expanded public transportation system in the region
- an expanded bicycle network
- ITS initiatives being planned by WisDOT and IDOT

The area east of the I-90/I-39 corridor will be experiencing growth within the next 3 to 30 years. To adequately plan for the growth in this area, the existing rural road system needs to be improved. One of the improvements being planning is the construction of interchanges with the I-90/I-39 corridor (as noted above) and to upgrade the existing rural road system by constructing new highway links. While the LRTP does plan for improvements to other modes of transportation within the RATS planning area and within this specific subarea, the predominant mode of transportation will continue to be the automobile. While the federal, state and local transportation planning processes will include "smart growth" and "balanced growth" principals in this process, the automobile will be the main means of transportation within the next five to ten years. Accordingly, the RATS LRTP identifies the growth subareas and plans for transportation improvements as well as recognizes the possibility that this type of growth might lead to increased air

quality concerns. During 2004 and 2005 the two reporting ozone air quality stations in Winnebago County reported no air quality violations. Accordingly, RATS believes that Winnebago County and the metro planning area will maintain its **Attainment** status from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (US-EPA).

2. PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION

The comments RATS received regarding public transportation were directed toward expansion of service, adding amenities and extending connections to other transit systems in the region. Currently, RATS, the Rockford Mass Transit District (RMTD), the State Line Area Transportation Study (SLATS), the Beloit Transit System (BTS) and the villages of Roscoe and Rockton have been meeting to determine and analyze the possible connections of RMTD and BTS. As a result of continual growth in the northeast portion of Winnebago County, the issue of providing some type of public transportation service to this area is being studied. Staffs from both RMTD and BTS have projected costs to operate connecting service and researched potential routes to connect the two transit services. The initial discussions and preliminary findings from the MPOs and from Village officials of both Rockton and Roscoe have been encouraging. Before a final proposal can be prepared for public review, several details still need to be finalized. In addition to these discussions, FTA funds have been apportioned to the area to allow for the acquisition of transit vehicles.

Regarding extending service hours, RMTD does offer night service during the week. However, the frequency of service and the number of service miles is lower compared to their daytime service. The amount of funds available to operate this service and the scheduled work-shift times for night-time employment centers essentially determined the type of service that RMTD now offers. Currently, RMTD is working with RATS, the Boone and Winnebago County Workforce Connection Board, and Work, Welfare and Families (WWF) to study several corridors that would extend RMTD service beyond what is currently being provided. As more employment centers expand their hours and as new employment locations are created in the Rockford Urban Area, access to jobs for the transportation disadvantaged will become critical. WWF received a grant from The Grand Victoria Foundation to identify locations to extend transportation services for low wage workers so that they might have easier access to these jobs. As funds becoming available in the future, additional service may be implemented.

The Rockford metro area, through two private providers, does have direct bus service between Rockford and Chicago. One provider, Van Galder Bus Company, provides 18-inbound bus trips to O'Hare Airport and 17-outbound to Rockford every day. This same company also provides 4-inbound trips and 3-outbound trips between Madison, Wisconsin and the Amtrak service in downtown Chicago (with a stop in Rockford) every day. Another provider, Greyhound Bus Lines, provides weekday and Saturday service between Chicago and Madison, with a stopover in Rockford. Both providers have bus terminal facilities on the east side of Rockford, at the I-90/39 and East State Street interchange. RMTD does provide connecting service to these two locations.

3. BICYCLE FACILITIES

The comments RATS received concerning bicycle facilities were directed toward a more comprehensive – connecting bicycle route system. As mentioned in the LRTP, RATS would need to join the “existing paths, especially in an east-west manner...” and “...the use of on-street lanes or routes as a method of connectivity was also highly ranked by a citizens advisory committee”. The LRTP further states:

“on-street routes/lanes could provide an important and cost-effective means of connecting the existing bikeway system. However, this issue will need to be addressed by the Rockford MPO Technical and Policy Committees. The use of on-street bikeway facilities would be a major change in the bikeway system in the Rockford MPA.”

To undertake this effort, the adopted RATS FY-2006 Unified Work Program has programmed planning funds to begin a study to identify the existing on-street facilities that would be needed to connect with the

off-street shared use paths. As part of the study objectives the possibility of putting bicycle racks on RMTD buses will be explored and locations along the routes where bus stops can safely accommodate bicyclists mounting their bikes will be inventoried. A portion of the study will review the existing street network around these bike-bus safety-loading zones to identify suitable bicycle network links to these locations. Essentially, most of the comments received on this subject will be addressed in the forthcoming RATS Bicycle / Pedestrian Study.

4. WILLOW CREEK BIKE PATH

Both the RATS LRTP and the Boone and Winnebago Regional Greenway Plan contain a bicycle connecting link planned to provide direct access to/from Rock Cut State Park (RCSP) and the Long Prairie Trail/Stone Bridge Nature Trail near Caledonia. As indicated in both planning documents, this connecting link is planned to be located parallel to Willow Creek. The existing path on the west side of RCSP is located along the Willow Creek greenway to Harlem High School. One of the comments RATS received on this issue is from a property owner along the Willow Creek corridor. The other comment expressed an opinion that a bike facility should be placed on or near the north side of RCSP. Both planning documents contain reference to the IL 173 / I-90 interchange construction project, where a separate path is to be constructed on the south side of the IL 173 corridor. The Rockford Urban Area has received High Priority Project funds to start the engineering phase of this project. As this project advances, several corridors will be analyzed for the final alignment and at the appropriate times, the public will be able to review the documents and to submit comments.

5. EAST SIDE ARTERIAL CONNECTOR

During the public comment period and the four public informational open houses, three comments were received on this new highway facility. The East Side Arterial Connector (ESAC) is planned to be constructed on the east side of the I-90/39 corridor between the proposed interchange at Perry Creek Road and the area just north of IL 173. One of the comments stated that traffic movements in this area should use Perryville Road, which is parallel and located directly west of I-90/39, one to three miles from the ESAC proposed route alignments. RATS analyses with the travel demand model as well as professional publications on travel flow theory indicate that very little traffic would use Perryville Road for trip ends along the ESAC corridor due to the following:

- the projected land use and density changes east of the I-90/39 corridor are no longer rural in nature
- the increased distance and travel time for multiple crossings of I90/39 between the ESAC and Perryville Road would be unacceptable
- the planned interchanges with I-90/39 at Perry Creek Road and IL 173 will increase the desirability for regional and local traffic to use the tollway as part of the local transportation network

Another comment was made which suggested that the ESAC be located through or next to Rock Cut State Park (RCSP). Winnebago County Highway Department (WCHD) is the lead agency for the construction of the ESAC. RATS staff, along with staff from the City of Rockford, City of Loves Park and other local agencies have provided assistance and input into an alignment analysis currently being conducted by WCHD. One of the alignments that has been studied is the RCSP corridor. As an agency on the RATS Policy Committee and Technical Committee, Winnebago County will inform RATS as this study progresses.

The last comment received on this issue suggested that different alignments be investigated and a list of “pros & cons” be developed. RATS has forwarded this request on to WCHD for their review and as a possible exhibit to their alignment analysis.

6. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS

RATS staff received two technical corrections on the draft LRTP from the Rockford Mass Transit District (RMTD) and the City of Rockford-Community Development Department (R-CD). The comments submitted by RTMD and R-CD were just minor language and grammatical errors that both agencies found in the draft document. The final document has been corrected with these changes.

7. SUMMARY

RATS has adopted a Public Involvement Progress (PIP) report, which serves as the framework to respond to public comments received during the development of the LRTP. For the comments received during the planning process, including the public comment period and the public informational open houses, all were considered during the preparation of the LRTP and prior to final adoption by the RATS Policy Committee.

The RATS Year 2035 LRTP overall goal “is to promote a safe and efficient transportation system for people and goods in the RATS MPA that provides a balanced multi-modal system that minimizes costs and impacts to the taxpayer, society and the environment.” During the past several decades the Rockford urban area has continued to grow beyond the traditional limits of just one urban center. As this growth continues a more diverse and mobile population will be need to be studied as part of the RATS planning process during the next thirty years. Public comments received represent very specific points-of-view, often times opposing other public comments or RATS staff. The RATS MPO is concerned about all comments, and seeks to determine how they impact the overall goals and objectives of RATS, including past and current federal transportation, environmental and public guidelines, while being sensitive to the economic core and future growth of the Rockford MPA and its surrounding environs. Moreover, the LRTP strives to maintain and enhance the quality of life for the greater benefit of the general population and its diverse communities.

RATS

**Rockford Area Transportation Study
Metropolitan Planning Organization**
City of Rockford, Public Works Department
425 East State Street, Rockford, IL 61104

POLICY COMMITTEE

Mayor Lawrence J. Morrissey, City of Rockford
Mayor Darryl F. Lindberg, City of Loves Park
Board Chairman Scott H. Christiansen, Winnebago County
President Linda M. Vaughn, Village of Machesney Park
Mayor Frederic C. Brereton, City of Belvidere
Board Chairman Susan L. Anderson, Boone County
Deputy Director Gregory L. Mounts, Illinois Department of Transportation,
Region 2

PUBLIC INFORMATION OPEN HOUSE

ROCKFORD AREA TRANSPORTATION STUDY (RATS) YEAR 2035 LONG-RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN

A public informational open house will be held at four area locations to present the **DRAFT Year 2035 Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) for the Rockford Area Transportation Study (RATS)**. The plan covers anticipated transportation needs in the Rockford Metropolitan Planning Area for the next 30 years. The plan is a co-operative effort of RATS, local governments and the Illinois Department of Transportation. The DRAFT is currently available for public review and downloading at the City of Rockford / RATS web site at http://cityofrockford.net/government/works/index.cfm?section=planning&id=1232#draft_2005-2035.

This plan is updated every five years. The last time the LRTP was updated and adopted by the RATS Policy Committee was July 27, 2000. It is tentatively schedule for adoption at the July 28, 2005 RATS Policy Committee, 1:15 P.M., at Rockford City Hall, 425 East State Street, Rockford, IL.

Local, state and federal governments have the responsibility for constructing, operating and maintaining most of the transportation systems in the Rockford Metropolitan Planning Area. This LRTP was developed in the interest of promoting, developing and maintaining a safe and efficient transportation system that will meet the needs of the area's citizens, businesses and industries through the Year 2035. This LRTP considered a wide range of citizen, community and technical input as well as the views, priorities and plans expressed in numerous previous plans and documents developed as part the RATS planning process over the last 40 years. This LRTP reflects the goals, priorities and guidance originating from Federal law, specially the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA) and the 1998 Transportation Efficiency Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21).

The overall goal of the plan is to promote a safe and efficient transportation system for people and goods that provides a balanced multi-modal system that minimizes costs and impacts to the taxpayer, society and the environment. The plan addresses the growth projected for the area's airports, the area's bicycle and pedestrian facilities, rail service to the region, public transportation issues, maintaining and improving the area's highway system and public funding issues.

The format of these open houses is to allow an informal discussion between the public and RATS staff. The times are indicated below.

DATES

July 6, 2005 – Wednesday 11:00 AM to 2:00 PM Rockford Public Library Auditorium 215 N Wyman Street Rockford, IL	July 6, 2005 – Wednesday 3:30 PM to 7:00 PM North Suburban Library Community Room 5562 Clayton Circle Roscoe, IL	July 7, 2005 – Thursday 11:00 AM to 2:00 PM Loves Park City Hall Cafeteria Room 100 Heart Boulevard Loves Park, IL	July 7, 2005 – Thursday 3:30 PM to 7:00 PM Belvidere Community Building – Banquet Room 111 West 1 st Street Belvidere, IL
--	---	---	---

PURPOSE:

View Graphic Displays, Discuss Study Goals and Objectives, Ask Questions
and Obtain Public Comments and Input

For further information, contact

Gary W. McIntyre, RATS Planner
City of Rockford / RATS
425 East State Street, Rockford, IL 61104
815/987-5638 (voice) 815/967-7058 (fax)
email: gary.mcintyre@ci.rockford.il.us

Hayes Morrison, RATS Planner
City of Rockford / RATS
425 East State Street, Rockford, IL 61104
815/987-5628 (voice) 815/967-7058 (fax)
email: hayes.morrison@ci.rockford.il.us

NOTICE OF TRANSPORTATION PLANNING

Notice is hereby given that the Rockford Area Transportation Study (RATS), the federally-designated Metropolitan Planning Organization for the Rockford Urban and Metropolitan area, is seeking public comment on the transportation planning process and the development of the following documents. RATS coordinates publicly funded transportation planning and improvements among the various jurisdictions in Winnebago and Boone Counties.

1. **RATS FY-2006 UNIFIED WORK PROGRAM (UWP).** This document specifies the transportation planning work proposed over the next year (July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2006). A draft of the FY-2006 UWP is now available and will be considered for adoption on May 26, 2005. Comments will be accepted at the Technical Committee meeting at 10:00 a.m. on May 19th and at the Policy Committee meeting at 1:15 p.m. on May 26th, both in Loves Park City Hall.

2. **RATS FY-2006 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP).** This document will identify and prioritize all major transportation and public transit improvements scheduled for implementation in the RATS Metropolitan Area in the next three years (July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2008). The document is now under development and a draft will be available for inspection before the end of July 2005. The target adoption is on or about August 25, 2005. Public comments will be accepted anytime, but should be submitted prior to August 18, 2005.

3. **RATS LONG-RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN (LRP).** The LRP discusses, plans and assigns priority for all major transportation systems improvements for the Metropolitan Area over the next 20 to 30 years. The existing LRP is available for inspection and can be amended at any time. At this time, the Year 2000-2025 LRP is being comprehensively updated. Public comments and input is encouraged. The target adoption date by the RATS Policy Committee is scheduled July 28, 2005 at Rockford City Hall.

Public comments are welcomed on all the above work and at all RATS meetings or by contact RATS by telephoning, e-mailing or writing. RATS Technical Committee meetings are typically held on the third Thursday of each month and the Policy Committee meetings on the following Thursday. The exact meeting dates, times, and locations are finalized and announced at least a week in advance. Persons seeking to be placed on the RATS mailing list so that they can receive copies of announcements, agendas and other reports should contact RATS Staff by (1) telephoning 815/987-5638 (Gary W. McIntyre), (2) e-mailing gary.mcintyre@ci.rockford.il.us, or (3) writing RATS, Rockford City Hall, 425 East State Street, Rockford, IL 61104. Information is also available at the City of Rockford web site cityofrockford.net.

Date of notice: April 27, 2005

Rockford Register Star rrstar.com

 [Print This Page](#)

 [Close window](#)

Published: November 15, 2004

Local News: Rockford

Bikers, walkers, runners urged to share ideas on area paths

▪ Officials have eight months to update long-range plans for the region's network of trails.

By **MIKE DEDONCKER**, *Rockford Register Star*

[>> Click here for more about Mike](#)

ROCKFORD -- Bob Sharp is a longtime runner who doesn't recall another time when the local government sought his opinion on the status of bike and pedestrian paths.

A member and former president of the Rockford Road Runners Club, Sharp will lend his voice to leaders who are updating the area's long-range plans for such paths. Other voices are welcome, said Gary McIntyre, planner for the Rockford Area Transportation Study.

The study is a consortium that prioritizes area road projects and other transit projects that rely on federal money. One requirement is that its long-range transportation plan be updated every five years. The current plan expires July 27, and McIntyre said the bike-pedestrian path element needs improvement.

That's where Sharp and anyone else interested in the paths come in.

"We have about eight months until the update is due, and we want to get the public involved in the early stages of planning," said McIntyre, who has contacted running, biking and conservation clubs.

Sharp thinks the area needs more places where people can run or work out and stay away from traffic.

"Not that I'm bad-mouthing it, but even Perryville Path, as big as it is, is tough to use at night or early morning if you're going north," he said. "The lights from oncoming traffic blind you because it has no lights."

Bike-pedestrian paths have not been reviewed since the

How to help

A date for an initial meeting to discuss the Rockford Area Transportation Study plan and the bike-pedestrian path element will be announced before Thanksgiving. A second meeting would be scheduled specifically to discuss bike-pedestrian path planning.

If you are interested in becoming part of the planning process, contact Gary McIntyre at gary.mcintyre@ci.rockford.il.us or 815-987-5638.



Rockford Register Star file photo/Eddy Montville

Gary McIntyre (right) of the city of Rockford explains to T.K. Nigam how a new road would help ease Perryville traffic at a public meeting in October at the Indoor Sports Center in Loves Park. McIntyre says the area's bike-pedestrian path system needs improvement and wants to get the public involved in early planning stages..

[View full-sized photo](#)

early 1990s.

"At that time, we did look on the east side of Rockford as a response to the Perryville Path," McIntyre said.

"Also, since that time, there's been new information that has become available that we need to address. In 1999, they came out with a new guide for the development of bicycle facilities and within the past month they came out with one for pedestrian facilities, which I haven't gotten yet. Our current plan does not include those engineering and planning criteria."

New bike-pedestrian path initiatives include corridor studies on Harrison Avenue, South Main and West State streets, and Illinois 173.

Discussions will include three paths that are nearing construction:

- A path from Davis Park to Central Avenue, for which the city has received about \$1.6 million.

"We call that the Davis-Pec Path," McIntyre said. "That will parallel the Canadian National Railroad line from the existing path in Davis Park and then, when it goes out to Central Avenue, it will connect with the Pecatonica Prairie Path."

McIntyre said the Pecatonica Prairie Path has received more than \$5 million in federal funds to go from Central Avenue in Rockford to Freeport along the old Illinois Central rail line, which is a ComEd right of way.


- A continuation of the Perryville Path, likely to be built in the next two years, from State Street and Argus Drive near the Saturn of Rockford dealership south to the Swanson Path behind the old Menards south of Harrison Avenue.

Plans call for the path to follow Argus Drive, cross State Street, go through the new Wal-Mart site and then head south on Bell School Road.

- A portion of the Pecatonica Prairie Path from Meridian to Conger roads.



"This is a plan that we want to reach out to the public," McIntyre said, "and, hopefully, have the public get involved in the planning process."

Contact: mdedoncker@rrstar.com; 815-987-1382

 [Print This Page](#)

 [Close window](#)

Rockford Register Star rrstar.com

 [Print This Page](#) [Close window](#)

Published: November 17, 2004

Editorial

Get moving so you can get moving

Bikers, runners and walkers should speak now or forever hold their nitpicking about regional recreational paths that are in the planning stages and yet to be built.

Someone is listening. Gary McIntyre, planner for the Rockford Area Transportation Study, is asking for input and ideas on long-term planning for bike-pedestrian paths.

The last time the overall plan for the paths was reviewed was in the early 1990s, and a lot has changed since then, including a tremendous increase in vehicular traffic on Rockford's east side. Safety on the paths is a primary concern.



McIntyre initially reached out to area biking, running and conservation clubs to get feedback on the situation now and future needs.

He's going a step further by soliciting input from the public. Meetings will be scheduled soon to discuss overall transportation plans and how the bike-pedestrian system fits into them.

Specifically, discussions will focus on three paths that are getting close to construction because money has been set aside for them. They are:

- A path from Davis Park to Central Avenue, and then along the old Illinois Central rail line to Freeport.
- A Perryville Path extension, from State Street and Argus Drive south to Harrison Avenue.
- A link between Meridian and Conger roads on the Pecatonica Prairie Path.

Now is the time to be part of the discussion. E-mail McIntyre at gary.mcintyre@ci.rockford.il.us, or call him at 815-987-5638.

 [Print This Page](#) [Close window](#)

Rockford Register Star rrstar.com

Recommendations for RATS' long-range transportation plan

Ed Barsotti, League of Illinois Bicyclists, February 1, 2005

The League of Illinois Bicyclists offers the following suggestions for the bicycle/pedestrian component of its current long-range transportation planning effort.

Recommend that Rockford Area Transportation Study adopts a "Complete Streets" policy, such as the Federal Highway Administration's "Accommodating Bicycle and Pedestrian Travel" policy statement (attached), as a "performance standard" for all street and highway projects undertaken by member jurisdictions. The FHWA policy states: "Bicycling and walking facilities will be incorporated into all transportation projects unless exceptional circumstances exist." Cost limits and adequate need are ensured.

Recommend that RATS develops a standard "Project Agreement" form that would be signed by the sponsor or lead agency for every project included in RATS' TIP. This form would become part of the MPO/TIP official record and treated as a pre-condition for any major investment in the project. The form would require a statement of exactly what kind of provision(s) will be included in the project to address the Complete Streets Policy. The Project Agreement would be required to be signed by both the lead agency director (or designee) and the appropriate elected official (or designee) and would be treated as a binding commitment.

To accommodate the need for flexibility related to specific design treatments, recommend that RATS adopts a set of bicycle/pedestrian performance criteria. One set could be the Bicycle Level of Service (BLOS) and Pedestrian Level of Service (PLOS) measures. Together, these provide a reasonable picture on on-road and off-road conditions for a variety of non-motorized users. Require that BLOS and PLOS values both "before" (existing conditions) and "after" (new design) be reported on the Project Agreement form and in the TIP. The calculation is easily and quickly done at www.bikelib.org/roads/blos/balosform.htm

Recommend that RATS dedicate funding for an in-depth bicycle and pedestrian implementation plan by qualified consultants. The plan would cover the entire RATS planning area, detailing specific on-road retrofit improvements, off-road trails, pedestrian projects, and policy/ordinance changes such as those summarized here.

Recommend that RATS member jurisdictions dedicate annual funds for a non-motorized retrofit fund – separate from major capital improvement projects such as trails. These retrofit funds could be used at prioritized locations around town to fill short trail or sidewalk gaps, to improve dangerous crossings, or to install bike parking.

Recommend that RATS member jurisdictions each appoint a staff member to become familiar with the AASHTO bicycle and pedestrian guides and to do a detailed comparison with their jurisdiction's roadway design, development, and zoning policies. Recommend that the jurisdictions make appropriate policy changes to adhere to AASHTO guidance.

Recommend that RATS member jurisdictions adopt a bike parking ordinance for new commercial development. (Examples are available, from Naperville and elsewhere).

Recommend that an on-going RATS bike/ped committee be established to guide implementation of the non-motorized portion of the long-range plan (and the in-depth implementation plan), to routinely review road project and developments at an early stage, and to help prioritize use of capital improvement and retrofit funds. Membership may include residents from the 2005 RATS bike/ped long-range plan task force and representatives of RATS member jurisdictions.

Federal Highway Administration's "Accommodating Bicycle and Pedestrian Travel" policy statement

The following is the policy statement section of "Accommodating Bicycle and Pedestrian Travel: A Recommended Approach – A US DOT Policy Statement Integrating Bicycling and Walking into Transportation Infrastructure". The entire design guidance document is available at

<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bikeped/design.htm>

1. Bicycle and pedestrian ways shall be established in new construction and reconstruction projects in all urbanized areas unless one or more of three conditions are met:

- bicyclists and pedestrians are prohibited by law from using the roadway. In this instance, a greater effort may be necessary to accommodate bicyclists and pedestrians elsewhere within the right of way or within the same transportation corridor.
- the cost of establishing bikeways or walkways would be excessively disproportionate to the need or probable use. Excessively disproportionate is defined as exceeding twenty percent of the cost of the larger transportation project.
- where sparsity of population or other factors indicate an absence of need. For example, the Portland Pedestrian Guide requires "all construction of new public streets" to include sidewalk improvements on both sides, unless the street is a cul-de-sac with four or fewer dwellings or the street has severe topographic or natural resource constraints.

2. In rural areas, paved shoulders should be included in all new construction and reconstruction projects on roadways used by more than 1,000 vehicles per day, as in States such as Wisconsin. Paved shoulders have safety and operational advantages for all road users in addition to providing a place for bicyclists and pedestrians to operate.

Rumble strips are not recommended where shoulders are used by bicyclists unless there is a minimum clear path of four feet in which a bicycle may safely operate.

3. Sidewalks, shared use paths, street crossings (including over- and undercrossings), pedestrian signals, signs, street furniture, transit stops and facilities, and all connecting pathways shall be designed, constructed, operated and maintained so that all pedestrians, including people with disabilities, can travel safely and independently.

4. The design and development of the transportation infrastructure shall improve conditions for bicycling and walking through the following additional steps:

- planning projects for the long-term. Transportation facilities are long-term investments that remain in place for many years. The design and construction of new facilities that meet the criteria in item 1) above should anticipate likely future demand for bicycling and walking facilities and not preclude the provision of future improvements. For example, a bridge that is likely to remain in place for 50 years, might be built with sufficient width for safe bicycle and pedestrian use in anticipation that facilities will be available at either end of the bridge even if that is not currently the case
- addressing the need for bicyclists and pedestrians to cross corridors as well as travel along them. Even where bicyclists and pedestrians may not commonly use a particular travel corridor that is being improved or constructed, they will likely need to be able to cross that corridor safely and conveniently. Therefore, the design of intersections and interchanges shall accommodate bicyclists and pedestrians in a manner that is safe, accessible and convenient.
- getting exceptions approved at a senior level. Exceptions for the non-inclusion of bikeways and walkways shall be approved by a senior manager and be documented with supporting data that indicates the basis for the decision.
- designing facilities to the best currently available standards and guidelines. The design of facilities for bicyclists and pedestrians should follow design guidelines and standards that are commonly used, such as the AASHTO *Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities*, AASHTO's *A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets*, and the ITE Recommended Practice "Design and Safety of Pedestrian Facilities"



Design Guidance

Accommodating Bicycle and Pedestrian Travel: A Recommended Approach

A US DOT Policy Statement

Integrating Bicycling and Walking into Transportation Infrastructure

On this page:

- [Purpose](#)
- [Introduction](#)
- [The Challenge: Balancing Competing Interests](#)
- [Policy Statement](#)
- [Policy Approach](#)
- [Applying Engineering Judgement to Roadway Design](#)
- [Actions](#)
- [Conclusion](#)
- [Further Information and Resources](#)
 - [General Design Resources](#)
 - [Pedestrian Facility Design Resources](#)
 - [Bicycle Facility Design Resources](#)
 - [Bicycle and Pedestrian Design Resources](#)
 - [Traffic Calming Design Resources](#)
 - [ADA Related Design Resources](#)
 - [Trail Design Resources](#)

Purpose

Accommodating Bicycle and Pedestrian Travel: A Recommended Approach is a policy statement adopted by the United States Department of Transportation. USDOT hopes that public agencies, professional associations, advocacy groups, and others adopt this approach as a way of committing themselves to integrating bicycling and walking into the transportation mainstream.

The Design Guidance incorporates three key principles:

- a. a policy statement that **bicycling and walking facilities will be incorporated into all transportation projects** unless exceptional circumstances exist;
- b. an approach to achieving this policy that has already worked in State and local agencies; and
- c. a series of action items that a public agency, professional association, or advocacy group can take to achieve the overriding goal of improving conditions for bicycling and walking.

The Policy Statement was drafted by the U.S. Department of Transportation in response to Section 1202 (b) of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) with the input and assistance of public agencies, professional associations and advocacy groups.

[TOP](#)

Introduction

Bicycling and walking issues have grown in significance throughout the 1990s. As the new millennium dawns public agencies and public interest groups alike are striving to define the most appropriate way in which to accommodate the two modes within the overall transportation system so that those who walk or ride bicycles can safely, conveniently, and comfortably access every destination within a community.

Public support and advocacy for improved conditions for bicycling and walking has created a widespread acceptance that more should be done to enhance the safety, comfort, and convenience of the nonmotorized traveler. Public opinion surveys throughout the 1990s have demonstrated strong support for increased planning, funding and implementation of shared use paths, sidewalks and on-street facilities.

At the same time, public agencies have become considerably better equipped to respond to this demand. Research and practical experience in designing facilities for bicyclists and pedestrians has generated numerous national, State and local design manuals and resources. An increasing number of professional planners and engineers are familiar with this material and are applying this knowledge in towns and cities across the country.

The 1990 Americans with Disabilities Act, building on an earlier law requiring curb ramps in new, altered, and existing sidewalks, added impetus to improving conditions for sidewalk users. People with disabilities rely on the pedestrian and transit infrastructure, and the links between them, for access and mobility.

Congress and many State legislatures have made it considerably easier in recent years to fund nonmotorized projects and programs (for example, the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act and the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century), and a number of laws and regulations now mandate certain planning activities and design standards to guarantee the inclusion of bicyclists and pedestrians.

Despite these many advances, injury and fatality numbers for bicyclists and pedestrians remain stubbornly high, levels of bicycling and walking remain frustratingly low, and most communities continue to grow in ways that make travel by means other than the private automobile quite challenging. Failure to provide an accessible pedestrian network for people with disabilities often requires the provision of costly paratransit service. Ongoing investment in the Nation's transportation infrastructure is still more likely to overlook rather than integrate bicyclists and pedestrians.

In response to demands from user groups that every transportation project include a bicycle and pedestrian element, Congress asked the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to study various approaches to accommodating the two modes. The Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) instructs the Secretary to work with professional groups such as AASHTO, ITE, and other interested parties to recommend policies and standards that might achieve the overall goal of fully integrating bicyclists and pedestrians into the transportation system.

TEA-21 also says that, "Bicycle transportation facilities and pedestrian walkways shall be considered, where appropriate, in conjunction with all new construction and reconstruction of transportation projects, except where bicycle and pedestrian use are not permitted." (Section 1202)

In August 1998, FHWA convened a Task Force comprising representatives from FHWA, AASHTO, ITE, bicycle and pedestrian user groups, State and local agencies, the U.S. Access Board and representatives of disability organizations to seek advice on how to proceed with developing this guidance. The Task Force reviewed existing and proposed information on the planning and technical design of facilities for bicyclists and pedestrians and concluded that these made creation of another design manual unnecessary. For example, AASHTO published a bicycle design manual in 1999 and is working on a pedestrian facility manual.

The area where information and guidance was most lacking was in determining when to include designated or special facilities for bicyclists and pedestrians in transportation projects. There can also be uncertainty about the type of facility to provide, and the design elements that are required to ensure accessibility.

For example, when a new suburban arterial road is planned and designed, what facilities for bicyclists and pedestrians should be provided? The task force felt that once the decision to provide a particular facility was made, the specific information on designing that facility is generally available. However, the decision on whether to provide sidewalks on neither, one or both sides of the road, or a rounder, striped bike lane, wide outside lane or separate trail for bicyclists is usually made with little guidance or help.

After a second meeting with the Task Force in January 1999, FHWA agreed to develop a **Policy Statement on Accommodating Bicyclists**

SEC. 1202. BICYCLE TRANSPORTATION AND PEDESTRIAN WALKWAYS.

(b) Design Guidance.-

(1) In general.-In implementing section 217(g) of title 23, United States Code, the Secretary, in cooperation with the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, the Institute of Transportation Engineers, and other interested organizations, shall develop guidance on the various approaches to accommodating bicycles and pedestrian travel.

(2) Issues to be addressed. -The guidance shall address issues such as the level and nature of the demand, volume, and speed of motor vehicle traffic, safety, terrain, cost, and sight distance.

(3) Recommendations. -The guidance shall include recommendations on amending and updating the policies of the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials relating to highway and street design standards to accommodate bicyclists and pedestrians.

(4) Time period for development. -The guidance shall be developed within 18 months after the date of enactment of

and Pedestrians in Transportation Projects to guide State and local agencies in answering these questions. Task Force members

this Act.

recommended against trying to create specific warrants for different facilities (warrants leave little room for engineering judgement and have often been used to avoid providing facilities for bicycling and walking). Instead, the purpose of the Policy Statement is to provide a recommended approach to the accommodation of bicyclists and pedestrians that can be adopted by State and local agencies (as well as professional societies and associations, advocacy groups, and Federal agencies) as a commitment to developing a transportation infrastructure that is safe, convenient, accessible, and attractive to motorized AND nonmotorized users alike. The Policy Statement has four elements:

- a. an acknowledgment of the issues associated with balancing the competing interests of motorized and nonmotorized users;
- b. a recommended policy approach to accommodating bicyclists and pedestrians (including people with disabilities) that can be adopted by an agency or organizations as a statement of policy to be implemented or a target to be reached in the future;
- c. a list of recommended actions that can be taken to implement the solutions and approaches described above; and
- d. further information and resources on the planning, design, operation, and maintenance of facilities for bicyclists and pedestrians.



TOP

The Challenge: Balancing Competing Interests

For most of the second half of the 20th Century, the transportation, traffic engineering and highway professions in the United States were synonymous. They shared a singular purpose: building a transportation system that promoted the safety, convenience and comfort of motor vehicles. The post-war boom in car and home ownership, the growth of suburban America, the challenge of completing the Interstate System, and the continued availability of cheap gasoline all fueled the development of a transportation infrastructure focused almost exclusively on the private motor car and commercial truck.

Initially, there were few constraints on the traffic engineer and highway designer. Starting at the centerline, highways were developed according to the number of motor vehicle travel lanes that were needed well into the future, as well as providing space for breakdowns. Beyond that, facilities for bicyclists and pedestrians, environmental mitigation, accessibility, community preservation, and aesthetics were at best an afterthought, often simply overlooked, and, at worst, rejected as unnecessary, costly, and regressive. Many States passed laws preventing the use of State gas tax funds on anything other than motor vehicle lanes and facilities. The resulting highway environment discourages bicycling and walking and has made the two modes more dangerous. Further, the ability of pedestrians with disabilities to travel independently and safely has been compromised, especially for those with vision impairments.

Over time, the task of designing and building highways has become more complex and challenging. Traffic engineers now have to integrate accessibility, utilities, landscaping, community preservation, wetland mitigation, historic preservation, and a host of other concerns into their plans and designs - and yet they often have less space and resources within which to operate and traffic volumes continue to grow.

The additional "burden" of having to find space for pedestrians and bicyclists was rejected as impossible in many communities because of space and funding constraints and a perceived lack of demand. There was also anxiety about encouraging an activity that many felt to be dangerous and fraught with liability issues. Designers continued to design from the centerline out and often simply ran out of space before bike lanes, paved shoulders, sidewalks and other "amenities" could be included.

By contrast, bicycle and pedestrian user groups argue the roadway designer should design highways from the right-of-way limits in, rather than the centerline out. They advocate beginning the design of a highway with the sidewalk and/or trail, including a buffer before the paved shoulder or bike lane, and then allocating the remaining space for motor vehicles. Through this approach, walking and bicycling are positively encouraged, made safer, and included as a critical element in every transportation project rather than as an afterthought in a handful of unconnected and arbitrary locations within a community.

Retrofitting the built environment often provides even more challenges than building new roads and communities: space is at a premium and there is a perception that providing better conditions for bicyclists and pedestrians will necessarily take away space or convenience from motor vehicles.

During the 1990s, Congress spearheaded a movement towards a transportation system that favors people and goods over motor vehicles with passage of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (1991) and the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (1998). The call for more walkable, liveable, and accessible communities, has seen bicycling and walking emerge as an "indicator species" for the health and well-being of a community. People want to live and work in places where they can safely and conveniently walk and/or bicycle and not always have to deal with worsening traffic congestion, road rage and the fight for a parking

space. Vice President Gore launched a Livability Initiative in 1999 with the ironic statement that "a gallon of gas can be used up just driving to get a gallon of milk."

The challenge for transportation planners, highway engineers and bicycle and pedestrian user groups, therefore, is to balance their competing interest in a limited amount of right-of-way, and to develop a transportation infrastructure that provides access for all, a real choice of modes, and safety in equal measure for each mode of travel.

This task is made more challenging by the widely divergent character of our nation's highways and byways. Traffic speeds and volumes, topography, land use, the mix of road users, and many other factors mean that a four-lane highway in rural North Carolina cannot be designed in the same way as a four-lane highway in New York City, a dirt road in Utah or an Interstate highway in Southern California. In addition, many different agencies are responsible for the development, management, and operation of the transportation system.

In a recent memorandum transmitting Program Guidance on bicycle and pedestrian issues to FHWA Division Offices, the Federal Highway Administrator wrote that "We expect every transportation agency to make accommodation for bicycling and walking a routine part of their planning, design, construction, operations and maintenance activities." The Program Guidance itself makes a number of clear statements of intent:

- Congress clearly intends for bicyclists and pedestrians to have safe, convenient access to the transportation system and sees every transportation improvement as an opportunity to enhance the safety and convenience of the two modes.
- "Due consideration" of bicycle and pedestrian needs should include, at a minimum, a presumption that bicyclists and pedestrians will be accommodated in the design of new and improved transportation facilities.
- To varying extents, bicyclists and pedestrians will be present on all highways and transportation facilities where they are permitted and it is clearly the intent of TEA-21 that all new and improved transportation facilities be planned, designed and constructed with this fact in mind.
- The decision not to accommodate [bicyclists and pedestrians] should be the exception rather than the rule. There must be exceptional circumstances for denying bicycle and pedestrian access either by prohibition or by designing highways that are incompatible with safe, convenient walking and bicycling.

The Program Guidance defers a suggested definition of what constitutes "exceptional circumstances" until this Policy Statement is completed. However, it does offer interim guidance that includes controlled access highways and projects where the cost of accommodating bicyclists and pedestrians is high in relation to the overall project costs and likely level of use by nonmotorized travelers.

Providing access for people with disabilities is a civil rights mandate that is not subject to limitation by project costs, levels of use, or exceptional circumstances". While the Americans with Disabilities Act doesn't require pedestrian facilities in the absence of a pedestrian route, it does require that pedestrian facilities, when newly constructed or altered, be accessible.

TOP

Policy Statement

Bicycle and pedestrian ways shall be established in new construction and reconstruction projects in all urbanized areas unless one or more of three conditions are met:

- bicyclists and pedestrians are prohibited by law from using the roadway. In this instance, a greater effort may be necessary to accommodate bicyclists and pedestrians elsewhere within the right of way or within the same transportation corridor.
- the cost of establishing bikeways or walkways would be excessively disproportionate to the need or probable use. Excessively disproportionate is defined as exceeding twenty percent of the cost of the larger transportation project.
- where sparsity of population or other factors indicate an absence of need. For example, the Portland Pedestrian Guide requires "all construction of new public streets" to include sidewalk improvements on both sides, unless the street is a cul-de-sac with four or fewer dwellings or the street has severe topographic or natural resource constraints.

In rural areas, paved shoulders should be included in all new construction and reconstruction projects on roadways used by more than 1,000 vehicles per day, as in States such as Wisconsin. Paved shoulders have safety and operational advantages for all road

users in addition to providing a place for bicyclists and pedestrians to operate.

Rumble strips are not recommended where shoulders are used by bicyclists unless there is a minimum clear path of four feet in which a bicycle may safely operate.

3. Sidewalks, shared use paths, street crossings (including over- and undercrossings), pedestrian signals, signs, street furniture, transit stops and facilities, and all connecting pathways shall be designed, constructed, operated and maintained so that all pedestrians, including people with disabilities, can travel safely and independently.

4. The design and development of the transportation infrastructure shall improve conditions for bicycling and walking through the following additional steps:

- planning projects for the long-term. Transportation facilities are long-term investments that remain in place for many years. The design and construction of new facilities that meet the criteria in item 1) above should anticipate likely future demand for bicycling and walking facilities and not preclude the provision of future improvements. For example, a bridge that is likely to remain in place for 50 years, might be built with sufficient width for safe bicycle and pedestrian use in anticipation that facilities will be available at either end of the bridge even if that is not currently the case
- addressing the need for bicyclists and pedestrians to cross corridors as well as travel along them. Even where bicyclists and pedestrians may not commonly use a particular travel corridor that is being improved or constructed, they will likely need to be able to cross that corridor safely and conveniently. Therefore, the design of intersections and interchanges shall accommodate bicyclists and pedestrians in a manner that is safe, accessible and convenient.
- getting exceptions approved at a senior level. Exceptions for the non-inclusion of bikeways and walkways shall be approved by a senior manager and be documented with supporting data that indicates the basis for the decision.
- designing facilities to the best currently available standards and guidelines. The design of facilities for bicyclists and pedestrians should follow design guidelines and standards that are commonly used, such as the AASHTO *Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities*, AASHTO's *A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets*, and the ITE Recommended Practice *"Design and Safety of Pedestrian Facilities"*.



Policy Approach

'Rewrite the Manuals' Approach

Manuals that are commonly used by highway designers covering roadway geometrics, roadside safety, and bridges should incorporate design information that integrates safe and convenient facilities for bicyclists and pedestrians -- including people with disabilities - into all new highway construction and reconstruction projects.

In addition to incorporating detailed design information - such as the installation of safe and accessible crossing facilities for pedestrians, or intersections that are safe and convenient for bicyclists - these manuals should also be amended to provide flexibility to the highway designer to develop facilities that are in keeping with transportation needs, accessibility, community values, and aesthetics. For example, the Portland Pedestrian Design Guide (June 1998) applies to every project that is designed and built in the city, but the Guide also notes that:

"Site conditions and circumstances often make applying a specific solution difficult. The Pedestrian Design Guide should reduce the need for ad hoc decision by providing a published set of guidelines that are applicable to most situations. Throughout the guidelines, however, care has been taken to provide flexibility to the designer so she or he can tailor the standards to unique circumstances. Even when the specific guideline cannot be met, the designer should attempt to find the solution that best meets the pedestrian design principles described [on the previous page]"

In the interim, these manuals may be supplemented by stand-alone bicycle and pedestrian facility manuals that provide detailed design information addressing on-street bicycle facilities, fully accessible sidewalks, crosswalks, and shared use paths, and other improvements.

Examples: Florida DOT has integrated bicycle and pedestrian facility design information into its standard highway design manuals and New Jersey DOT is in the process of doing so. Many States and localities have developed their own bicycle and pedestrian facility design manuals, some of which are listed in the final section of this document.

 TOP

Applying Engineering Judgement to Roadway Design

In rewriting manuals and developing standards for the accommodation of bicyclists and pedestrians, there is a temptation to adopt "typical sections" that are applied to roadways without regard to travel speeds, lane widths, vehicle mix, adjacent land uses, traffic volumes and other critical factors. This approach can lead to inadequate provision on major roads (e.g. a four foot bike lane or four foot sidewalk on a six lane high-speed urban arterial) and the over-design of local and neighborhood streets (e.g. striping bike lanes on low volume residential roads) , and leaves little room for engineering judgement.

After adopting the policy that bicyclists and pedestrians (including people with disabilities) will be fully integrated into the transportation system, State and local governments should encourage engineering judgement in the application of the range of available treatments.

For example:

- Collector and arterial streets shall typically have a minimum of a four foot wide striped bicycle lane, however wider lanes are often necessary in locations with parking, curb and gutter, heavier and/or faster traffic.
- Collector and arterial streets shall typically have a minimum of a five foot sidewalk on both sides of the street, however wider sidewalks and landscaped buffers are necessary in locations with higher pedestrian or traffic volumes, and/or higher vehicle speeds. At intersections, sidewalks may need to be wider to accommodate accessible curb ramps.
- Rural arterials shall typically have a minimum of a four foot paved shoulder, however wider shoulders (or marked bike lanes) and accessible sidewalks and crosswalks are necessary within rural communities and where traffic volumes and speeds increase.

This approach also allows the highway engineer to achieve the performance goal of providing safe, convenient, and comfortable travel for bicyclists and pedestrians by other means. For example, if it would be inappropriate to add width to an existing roadway to stripe a bike lane or widen a sidewalk, traffic calming measures can be employed to reduce motor vehicle speeds to levels more compatible with bicycling and walking.

 TOP

Actions

The United States Department of Transportation encourages States, local governments, professional associations, other government agencies and community organizations to adopt this Policy Statement as an indication of their commitment to accommodating bicyclists and pedestrians as an integral element of the transportation system. By so doing, the organization or agency should explicitly adopt one, all, or a combination of the various approaches described above AND should be committed to taking some or all of the actions listed below as appropriate for their situation.

- a. Define the exceptional circumstances in which facilities for bicyclists and pedestrians will NOT be required in all transportation projects.
- b. Adopt new manuals, or amend existing manuals, covering the geometric design of streets, the development of roadside safety facilities, and design of bridges and their approaches so that they comprehensively address the development of bicycle and pedestrian facilities as an integral element of the design of all new and reconstructed roadways.
- c. Adopt stand-alone bicycle and pedestrian facility design manuals as an interim step towards the adoption of new typical sections or manuals covering the design of streets and highways.
- d. Initiate an intensive re-tooling and re-education of transportation planners and engineers to make them conversant with the new information required to accommodate bicyclists and pedestrians. Training should be made available for, if not required of, agency traffic engineers and consultants who perform work in this field.

 TOP

Conclusion

There is no question that conditions for bicycling and walking need to be improved in every community in the United States; it is no longer acceptable that 6,000 bicyclists and pedestrians are killed in traffic every year, that people with disabilities cannot travel without encountering barriers, and that two desirable and efficient modes of travel have been made difficult and uncomfortable.

Every transportation agency has the responsibility and the opportunity to make a difference to the bicycle-friendliness and walkability of our communities. The design information to accommodate bicyclists and pedestrians is available, as is the funding. The United States Department of Transportation is committed to doing all it can to improve conditions for bicycling and walking and to make them safer ways to travel.

 TOP

Further Information and Resources

General Design Resources

A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets, 1994 (The Green Book). American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO), P.O. Box 96716, Washington, DC, 20090-6716, Phone: (888) 227-4860.

Highway Capacity Manual, Special Report 209, 1994. Transportation Research Board, Box 289, Washington, DC 20055, Phone: (202) 334-3214. Next Edition: FHWA Research Program project has identified changes to HCM related to bicycle and pedestrian design.

Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, 1988. Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250-7954. Next Edition: 2000, will incorporate changes to Part IX that will soon be subject of Notice of Proposed Rulemaking.

Flexibility in Highway Design, 1997. FHWA. HEP 30, 400 Seventh Street SW, Washington, DC 20590.

 TOP

Pedestrian Facility Design Resources

Design and Safety of Pedestrian Facilities, A Recommended Practice, 1998. Institute of Transportation Engineers, 525 School Street, S.W., Suite 410, Washington, DC 20024-2729, Phone: (202) 554-8050.

Pedestrian Compatible Roadways-Planning and Design Guidelines, 1995. Bicycle / Pedestrian Transportation Master Plan, Bicycle and Pedestrian Advocate, New Jersey Department of Transportation, 1035 Parkway Avenue, Trenton, NJ 08625, Phone: (609) 530-4578.

Improving Pedestrian Access to Transit: An Advocacy Handbook, 1998. Federal Transit Administration / WalkBoston. NTIS, 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, VA 22161.

Planning and Implementing Pedestrian Facilities in Suburban and Developing Rural Areas, Report No. 294A, Transportation Research Board, Box 289, Washington, DC 20055, Phone: (202) 334-3214.

Pedestrian Facilities Guidebook, 1997. Washington State Department of Transportation, Bicycle and Pedestrian Program, P.O. Box 47393, Olympia, WA 98504.

Portland Pedestrian Design Guide, 1998. Portland Pedestrian Program, 1120 SW Fifth Ave, Room 802; Portland, OR 97210. (503) 323-7004.

* *Implementing Pedestrian Improvements at the Local Level*, 1999. FHWA, HSR 20, 6300 Georgetown Pike, McLean, VA .

* *AASHTO Guide to the Development of Pedestrian Facilities*, 2000. AASHTO. (currently under discussion)

 TOP

Bicycle Facility Design Resources

Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities, 1999., American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO),

<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bikeped/design.htm>

Bicycle and Pedestrian Design Guidance

P.O. Box 96716, Washington, DC, 20090-6716, Phone: (888) 227-4860.

Implementing Bicycle Improvements at the Local Level, (1998), FHWA, HSR 20, 6300 Georgetown Pike, McLean, VA .

Bicycle Facility Design Standards, 1998. City of Philadelphia Streets Department, 1401 JFK Boulevard, Philadelphia, PA 19103.

Selecting Roadway Design Treatments to Accommodate Bicyclists, 1993. FHWA, R&T Report Center, 9701 Philadelphia Ct, Unit Q; Lanham, MD 20706. (301) 577-1421 (fax only)

North Carolina Bicycle Facilities Planning and Design Guidelines, 1994. North Carolina DOT, P.O. Box 25201, Raleigh, NC 27611. (919) 733-2804.

Bicycle Facility Planning, 1995. Pinsof & Musser. American Planning Association, Planning Advisory Service Report # 459. American Planning Association, 122 S. Michigan Ave, Suite 1600; Chicago, IL 60603.

Florida Bicycle Facilities Planning and Design Manual, 1994. Florida DOT, Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Office, 605 Suwannee Street, Tallahassee, FL 32399.

Evaluation of Shared-use Facilities for Bicycles and Motor Vehicles, 1996. Florida DOT, Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Office, 605 Suwannee Street, Tallahassee, FL 32399.

 TOP

Bicycle and Pedestrian Design Resources

Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan, 1995. Oregon Department of Transportation, Bicycle and Pedestrian Program, Room 210, Transportation Building, Salem, OR 97310, Phone: (503) 986-3555

Improving Conditions for Bicyclists and Pedestrians, A Best Practices Report, 1998. FHWA, HEP 10, 400 Seventh Street SW, Washington, DC 20590.

 TOP

Traffic Calming Design Resources

Traffic Calming: State of the Practice. 1999. Institute of Transportation Engineers, 525 School Street, SW, Suite 410; Washington, DC 20024.

Florida Department of Transportation's Roundabout Guide. Florida Department of Transportation, 605 Suwannee St., MS-82, Tallahassee, FL 32399-0450.

National Bicycling and Walking Study. Case Study # 19, Traffic Calming and Auto-Restricted Zones and other Traffic Management Techniques-Their Effects on Bicycling and Pedestrians, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA).

Traffic Calming (1995), American Planning Association, 122 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, IL 60603

Traditional Neighborhood Development Street Design Guidelines, 1997. Proposed Recommended Practice, Institute of Transportation Engineers, 525 School Street, SW, Suite 410; Washington, DC 20024.

Making Streets that Work, City of Seattle, 600 Fourth Ave., 12th Floor, Seattle, WA 98104-1873, Phone: (206) 684-4000, Fax: (206) 684-5360.

Traffic Control Manual for In-Street Work, 1994. Seattle Engineering Department, City of Seattle, 600 4th Avenue, Seattle, WA 98104-3667, Phone: (206) 684-5108.

 TOP

ADA-related Design Resources

<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bikeped/design.htm>

Accessible Pedestrian Signals, 1998. U.S. Access Board 1331 F Street NW, Suite 1000; Washington, DC 20004. (800) 872-2253.

Accessible Rights of Way: A Design Manual, 1999. U.S. Access Board, 1331 F Street NW, Suite 1000; Washington, DC 20004. (800) 872-2253.

Designing Sidewalks and Trails for Access, Part One. 1999. FHWA, HEPH-30, 400 Seventh Street SW, Washington, DC 20590.

ADA Accessibility Guidelines for Buildings and Facilities, 1998 (ADAAG). U.S. Access Board, 1331 F Street NW, Suite 1000; Washington, DC 20004. (800) 872-2253.

Uniform Federal Accessibility Standards, 1984 (UFAS), available from the U.S. Access Board, 1331 F Street NW, Suite 1000; Washington, DC 20004. (800) 872-2253

Universal Access to Outdoor Recreation: A Design Guide, 1993. PLAE, Inc, MIG Communications, 1802 Fifth Street, Berkeley, CA 94710. (510) 845-0953.

Recommended Street Design Guidelines for People Who Are Blind or Visually Impaired. American Council of the Blind, 1155 15th Street NW, Suite 720; Washington, DC 20005. (202) 467-5081.

 [TOP](#)

Trail Design Resources

Trails for the 21st Century, 1993. Rails to Trails Conservancy, 1100 17th Street NW, 10th Floor, Washington DC 20036. (202) 331-9696.

Greenways: A Guide to Planning, Design, and Development, 1993. The Conservation Fund. Island Press, 1718 Connecticut Ave NW, Suite 300; Washington, DC 20009.

Trail Intersection Design Guidelines, 1996. Florida Department of Transportation, 605 Suwannee St., MS-82, Tallahassee, FL 32399-0450.

* Indicates publication not yet available

 [TOP](#)

To provide Feedback, Suggestions or Comments for this page contact John C. Fegan at john.fegan@fhwa.dot.gov.

This page last modified on January 13, 2006



[FHWA Home](#) | [HEP Home](#) | [Feedback](#)

United States Department of Transportation - **Federal Highway Administration**